REMARKS

The Office Action mailed May 17, 2005, has alleged that the claims of the present application are directed to two distinct invention, with claim 1-13 being directed to a first invention, and claims 14-20 being directed to a second invention. Applicants hereby elect claim group II (claims 14-20), with traverse. In this regard, Applicants respectfully traverse the restriction requirement, as it is believe that the method and apparatus claims should stand or fall together in this application. Stated another way, from a substantive (prior art) standpoint, the same prior art should be relevant to both sets of claims, such that if independent claims 1 and 8 are found to be allowable, then independent claim 14 should be allowable for the same reasons (and vice versa). Requiring the Applicants to pursue these claims in two separate applications will impose an undue expense on the Applicants. Likewise, examining all claims in this single application will not impose extra burden on the Examiner (as the same prior art should be relevant for both sets of claims).

Therefore, Applicants respectfully request that the Examiner consider and examine all claims 1-20.

No fee is believed to be due in connection with this amendment and response. If, however, any fee is deemed to be payable, you are hereby authorized to charge any such fee to Deposit Account No. 20-0778.

Respectfully submitted,

Daniel R. McClure

Registration No. 38,962

THOMAS, KAYDEN, HORSTEMEYER & RISLEY, L.L.P.

Suite 1750 100 Galleria Parkway N.W. Atlanta, Georgia 30339 (770) 933-9500